

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 7, 9, 11-26, 31, 33, 35-50, 55, 57 and 59-72 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 25, and 49 are amended, no claims are cancelled, and no claims are added. The amendments to the claims as indicated herein do not add any new matter to this application. Furthermore, amendments made to the claims as indicated herein have been made to exclusively improve readability and clarity of the claims and not for the purpose of overcoming alleged prior art.

CLAIMS REJECTION--35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH REJECTION

Claims 1, 25 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was allegedly not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to practice the invention.

Applicant has amended Claim 1, 25, and 49 for clarification purposes only. Support for the amendment can be found *at least* in Claims 1, 25, and 49. The amendment to the claims does not change the scope of the claims. Removal of the rejection and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

CLAIMS REJECTION—35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 1, 25 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action states, “These limitations are not clear and are very difficult to decipher: ...” Accordingly, Applicant has amended Claim 1, 25, and 49 for clarification

purposes only. Support for the amendment can be found *at least* in Claims 1, 25, and 49 and on page 6, lines 6-7. The amendment to the claims does not change the scope of the claims.

Removal of the rejection and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS—35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 13, 16-19, 25, 26, 31, 37, 40-43, 49, 50, 55, 61, 62 and 65-67 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,317,761 ("Landsman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,687,746 ("Shuster"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Neither Landsman nor Shuster, alone or in combination, disclose the claimed feature of "causing the client to send to the porthole engine a second request for the requested content as an embedded item and the unrequested content as an embedded item." By admission in the Office Action (page 5, paragraph 4), Landsman fails such feature. Shuster does not teach or suggest said feature as set forth below.

In Shuster, a redirector mechanism ("redirector") transmits the frameset to the client computer (col. 8, lines 60-61). Hence, it appears that the Office Action considers Shuster's redirector to play the same role and the claimed porthole engine, because the claimed porthole engine sends (transmits) frame data (frameset) to the client. However, Shuster's redirector simply parses the URL request, which is an URL address. For example, the redirector parses a URL request and translates the request into a predefined provider subdomain and a client directory (col. 8, lines 28-34). As well, Shuster states, "Once the parsing of the address is complete, the redirector transmits... (col. 8, line 60). Shuster mentions parsing only URL addresses.

In contrast, the claimed porthole engine accesses "requested content," which is the content of the requested URL address, not the URL address itself. That is, the client sends to the porthole engine a second request for the requested content as an embedded item and the unrequested content as an embedded item. Nowhere in Shuster does the client send to the redirector a request for requested (or unrequested) content as an embedded item. That is because the redirector does not access content as does the claimed porthole engine.

Further, Shuster teaches that in response to receiving the frame data, the client requests **URLs** for various frames **from the provider computer** (col. 9, lines 8-12, emphasis added). However, that is not what is being claimed. Claim 1 expressly claims that the client sends the second request **to the porthole engine**. For example, it is unambiguously shown in Fig. 3 that the claimed porthole engine receives both the first request and the second request, which is not taught or suggested in Shuster. Also, in Shuster, it is the redirector that sends the frame data to the client, but it is not the redirector that receives the second request.

Not all claim features are taught or fairly suggested by Landsman and Shuster alone or in combination. Therefore, a prima facie case of obviousness was not established. Claims 1, 25, and 49 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 5-7, 13, 16-19, 26, 31, 37, 40-43, 50, 55, 61, 62 and 65-67 are dependent upon and therefore include all features of independent Claims 1, 25, and 49, which are in condition for allowance for the reasons given above. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 11, 12, 33, 35, 36, 57, 59 and 60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Landsman and Shuster in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,393 ("Eilbott"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 9, 11, 12, 33, 35, 36, 57, 59, and 60 are dependent upon and thus include all features of independent Claims 1, 25, and 49, respectively. Eilbott does not cure the deficiencies of Landsman and Shuster with respect to the features of Claims 1, 25, and 49. Therefore, the combination of the three references does not present a prima facie case of unpatentability of Claims 9, 11, 12, 33, 35, 36, 57, 59, and 60. Removal of the rejection and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Claims 14, 15, 38, 39, 63 and 64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Landsman and Shuster in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,653 ("Ackermann"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 14, 15, 38, 39, 63, and 64 are dependent upon and thus include all features of independent Claims 1, 25, and 49, respectively. Ackermann does not cure the deficiencies of Landsman and Shuster with respect to the features of Claims 1, 25, and 49. Therefore, the combination of the three references does not present a prima facie case of unpatentability of Claims 14, 15, 38, 39, 63, and 64. Removal of the rejection and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Claims 20, 44 and 68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Landsman and Shuster in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,873 ("Underwood"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 20, 44, and 68 are dependent upon and thus include all features of independent Claims 1, 25, and 49, respectively. Underwood does not cure the deficiencies of Landsman and Shuster with respect to the features of Claims 1, 25, and 49. Therefore, the combination of the three references does not present a prima facie case of unpatentability of Claims 20, 44, and 68. Removal of the rejection and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Claims 21-23, 45-47 and 69-71 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Landsman and Shuster in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,499,042 ("Markus"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 21-23, 45-47, and 69-71 are dependent upon and thus include all features of independent Claims 1, 25, and 49, respectively. Markus does not cure the deficiencies of Landsman and Shuster with respect to the features of Claims 1, 25, and 49. Therefore, the combination of the three references does not present a prima facie case of unpatentability of Claims 21-23, 45-47, and 69-71. Removal of the rejection and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Claims 24, 48 and 72 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Landsman and Shuster in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,991,810 ("Shapiro"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 24, 48, and 72 are dependent upon and thus include all features of independent Claims 1, 25, and 49, respectively. Shapiro does not cure the deficiencies of Landsman and Shuster with respect to the features of Claims 1, 25, and 49. Therefore, the combination of the three references does not present a prima facie case of unpatentability of Claims 24, 48, and 72. Removal of the rejection and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

Hickman Palermo Truong & Becker LLP

Dated: March 13, 2008

/JuliaAThomas#52283/

Julia A. Thomas

Reg. No. 52,283

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1089
Telephone No.: (408) 754-1451
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076